

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE TYPE-SPECIES OF *PHASIA*
(see volume 22, pages 243-245, volume 23, pages 9-11, 134-144, 196-197)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (Z.N.(S.) 1706)

Inasmuch as Dupuis and I are in general agreement, it is almost academic to comment further. However, as Dupuis has already noted, if the Commission should agree with us that the type-species of *Phasia* is *subcoleoprata*, they must reach some decision on how that is to be cited for the Official List. May I briefly make two comments:

1. The type-species should be cited as *Conops subcoleoprata* Linnaeus, not as "*Thereva subcoleoprata* (F. 1798)" as proposed by Dupuis. There is no nominal species *subcoleoprata* Fabricius, either as a new species or as a new name. Fabricius' citations refer back to Linnaeus, 1767. In both 1805 and 1810, Latreille referred *subcoleoprata* to Fabricius, but this was often done at that period, and the author's name is now corrected. It is not claimed that a misidentification was involved; rather, both Dupuis and I maintain that Latreille and Fabricius both had the correct *subcoleoprata*.

2. The different interpretations of type-fixation rest simply upon the question of whether Latreille (1804) is to be interpreted as including the six species of *Thereva* from Fabricius (1798) by his statement "les Thérèves de M. Fab." Contrary to Dupuis *Bulletin* 23:135, footnote 2), my interpretation rests on Article 69a(i): "the 'originally included species' comprise only those actually cited by name in the newly established genus" [italics mine]. In publishing *Phasia*, Latreille (1804) cited no nominal species by name; consequently, I concluded that *Phasia* was published without originally included nominal species. Latreille (1805) did include one species by name, and thus (Article 69a, ii, 2) fixed it as the type-species by subsequent monotypy.

FURTHER COMMENTS ON *PHASIA* LATREILLE Z.N.(S.) 1706

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

Herting (1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 23: 196-197) has presented several criticisms of my arguments against his proposed designation of a type-species for *Phasia*. It is essential to separate fact and opinion, and to be sure that the facts are clearly understood. The paragraph numbers below correspond to those of Herting's criticism.

2. The recognition and limits of a tribe are matters of opinion. I consider the two groups as generic groups (subtribes if one wishes) in the Phasiini, and hence I have no difficulty with the tribal name. If Dupuis and Herting restrict further and recognize the two groups as separate tribes, then nomenclaturally their subfamily Phasiinae must contain a typical tribe Phasiini (International Code, Art. 37), even as a genus divided into subgenera will contain a typical (nominate) subgenus bearing the same name. Dupuis, on the other hand, adopts Alophorini for the group containing *Phasia*, apparently because *Alophora* represents *Phasia* of authors, not Latreille.

It seems to me quite illogical, as well as incorrect nomenclaturally (Code, Art. 37), to adopt *Phasia* and Phasiinae, but not Phasiini. Incidentally, the more one restricts, and the more narrowly limited the "tribe" becomes, the more one depreciates the significance of past usage. Prior to Dupuis, and in the sense of some modern authors, the tribe Phasiini included all the genera in question; hence any restriction or more limited use will be a break with most of the literature of the past at the tribal level.

3. The type-species of *Phasia* is *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus, described from Sweden, not "*subcoleoprata* Fabricius". If it be considered that Latreille, author of *Phasia*,

misidentified the type-species, then the real question is what Latreille identified, not what Fabricius identified. Even if one does go back to Fabricius, one faces the fact that his basic material of *subcoleoprata* came from Sweden from the Bosc Collection (Fabricius, 1794, *Ent. Syst.* 4 : 283), and this is consistent with *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus, described from Upsala. Girschner's *Phasia rubra*, which Herting would recognize as type from Meigen's description of a specimen labelled "*subcoleoprata*" in the Fabrician Collection, is not known to occur in Sweden, as far as I am aware (cf. Dupuis, 1963, *Essai monographique sur les Phasiinae*, pp. 112-113).

4. Herting suggests the possibility that Fabricius obtained "the specimen(s) present in his own collection" from Bosc. It is also possible that Fabricius returned Bosc's material to Bosc, and that the Fabrician specimen(s) referred to by Meigen came from someone else and from somewhere else in Europe, and were misidentified by Fabricius, or perhaps considered as a variation. Indeed, because *rubra* does not occur in Sweden, the Fabrician-Meigen specimen(s) must have originated elsewhere in Europe. But both Herting's suggestion and mine are speculation, and basically irrelevant to the question of the identity of *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus, or of *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus sensu Latreille.

5. Of course, one cannot say positively that Latreille knew the true *subcoleoprata* of Linnaeus, but one can consider it highly probable: (1) Fabricius identified *subcoleoprata* from Sweden (!) in the Bosc Collection; (2) there is no question whatsoever that Bosc sent much material to Fabricius for identification and description (numerous references in Fabricius to "Mus. Dom Bosc"); (3) there is no question that such material was returned to Bosc (some years ago I personally studied Fabrician types of Bosc material in the Museum at Paris; see also Horn and Kahle, 1935, "Ueber entomologische Sammlungen", *Ent. Beihefte aus Berlin-Dahlem* 2 : 71 : "Typen [of Fabricius] auch im. . . Paris (ex coll. L.A.G. Bosc)"); (4) Latreille's known close friendship with Bosc and the obvious availability of the Bosc Collection make it highly probable, even "virtually certain", that he saw the Bosc Collection, and could have seen the *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus of Fabricius.

I believe that Herting is swayed by the two facts that Bosc was French and that the true *subcoleoprata* does not occur in France. Of more immediate relevance and importance are the two facts that Bosc did have material from other countries and that the *subcoleoprata* in his collection (det. Fabricius) came from Sweden. Finally, Herting quotes a letter of April 17, 1963, from Dupuis that "*subcoleoprata* n'existe pratiquement pas en France [which is true] et Latreille n'a travaillé que sur des textes" [which surely cannot be said with certainty]. In his most recent publication, Dupuis states "J'accorde à Sabrosky que Latreille aurait pu voir cette espèce dans la collection Bosc" (1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 23 : 136, footnote 7).

Incidentally, if Herting insists that Latreille worked only "sur des textes", that would destroy his own previous emphasis upon the absence of *subcoleoprata* from France, and upon the Fabrician specimen seen by Meigen, because the Fabrician text shows that the *subcoleoprata* of Fabricius in the Bosc Collection came from Sweden ("Habitat in Suecia. Mus. Dom Bosc").

6. See preceding paragraphs. It is not proved that Latreille worked only from published texts, and Dupuis now admits that Latreille could have seen the Bosc Collection.

7. The argument of this entire paragraph is coloured by the idea that the Bosc material must have come from France. I repeat: The Bosc material identified as *subcoleoprata* by Fabricius was from Sweden ("Habitat in Suecia").

8. My conclusions remain opposite to those of Herting.

9. In comment on the counter propositions of Dupuis (1966, *loc. cit.*: 142), I oppose the designation of "*Therava subcoleoprata* (F.1798)" as the type-species of *Phasia*, because such a nominal species does not exist. Fabricius clearly cited Linnaeus as the author of *subcoleoprata*. It would certainly be illogical to place *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus on the Official List of Specific Names, while ignoring the Linnaean authorship in citing it as the type-species of *Phasia*.